



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

moral and political. No error should be deemed slight which affects the meaning of a single word in the Bible ; where so much weight is attached to every single word ; and where so many inferences and conclusions are drawn from the slightest ground. Not merely those which find utterance in books, but a far greater number springing up in the minds of the millions to whom our English Bible is the code and canon of all truth. For this reason, errors, even the least, in a version of the Bible, are of far greater moment than in any other book, as well because the contents of the Bible are of far deeper importance, and have a far wider influence, as also because the readers of the Bible are not only the educated and the learned, who can exercise some sort of judgement in what they read, but vast multitudes who understand whatever they read according to the letter."

---

## THE VALUE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR A CORRECT KNOWLEDGE OF THE NEW.

BY PROFESSOR S. BURNHAM, D. D.,

Hamilton Theological Seminary, Hamilton, N. Y.

---

[This article is the *fourth* in a series on "The Value of the Old Testament for the Work of the Pastor," of which the first appeared in Vol. IV., No. 3, the second in Vol. IV., No. 4, the third in Vol. IV., No. 6.]

We are to consider what is the value of the Old Testament for the pastor, because of the aid which may be derived from it for the correct apprehension of the teachings of the New Testament. This value of the Old Testament for a correct knowledge of the New, is twofold.

I. The first element of value is the fact that the doctrinal teachings of the New Testament, and the meaning of its facts, are only fully and accurately to be known in the light of the facts and truths presented in the Old Testament.

It has already been shown, in treating of the first kind of Old Testament homiletical material,—namely, the History of the Central Preparation for the Incarnation,—that Jesus and his doctrines are only to be rightly understood and correctly known, when he and they are studied in the light of the history of Israel, and this history itself is regarded as the result of a continued divine on-going in human life towards the coming Incarnation. What is now claimed is similar to this, and yet different from it. It is now maintained, not only that Jesus and his teachings are not to be understood if the Old Testament is left out of account, but that all the New Testament writings

can only be fully and truly interpreted in the light of Old Testament truths and facts. It is, moreover, meant that the knowledge of the history of Israel is not alone sufficient for the man who would know the true meaning of the New Testament, but he must have also a knowledge of the doctrines taught in the Old Testament, and understand the real import of the various facts of religious and spiritual significance which it presents.

For the New Testament teaching is simply the complement of that of the Old. The New Testament has, in no sense, superseded or abrogated the Old; nor is its teaching a different teaching from that of the Old, if, by different, it is meant to imply any degree of opposition. God and man in the Old Testament are not other than they are in the New. The God of the Old Testament is, in his character, and in his essential relations to man, just what God is declared to be in the New Testament. There is not one way of salvation, one law of life, one code of ethics, in the Old Testament, and another, or a different, in the New. God is not doing one work in the world according to one set of principles, as he is presented to us in the Old Testament, and another according to new and different principles, as seen in the New. The work is, in both cases, essentially the same. The form of it may change indeed; but even thus, the new form is only the result and development of the old form. God's purpose for man is ever the same; His essential relations to him always unchanged; the principles on which He deals with him for good or for ill, eternally fixed, for they lie in His own immutable nature. It must be, therefore, that the New Testament doctrine owes both substance and form to the same essentials that underlie and shape the teaching of the Old Testament. Revelation is a unity.

But it is also a development. Like creation, revelation is a thing of gradual completion. In it, as in nature, the highest forms have appeared last. But these highest forms are not separate from and independent of the lower. On the contrary, they are possible only by the pre-existence of the lower forms, and in a certain sense, are the product of these lower forms. In essence and in determining factors, they are largely identical with the lower forms that have made them possible. They are, consequently, only to be understood by first comprehending well these lower forms. The zoologist must study the mollusca, if he is to give the full interpretation of man, and must not be ignorant of the larva, if he would rightly unfold the life-history of the butterfly, and explain its structure. So, too, the interpreter of the New Testament, to be truly successful in his work of unfolding these last teachings of the Spirit, must have a knowledge of the real mean-

ing of the facts and doctrines of the Old Testament, in which the lower forms of the great truths of revelation appear.

It must be useless to expect to enter into the real centre of Christianity but as the race entered it. The fact is that, in a very broad and deep sense, "Salvation is of the Jews," as our Lord himself declared. The Son of Man was a Jew, Paul was a Jew, the New Testament writers were all Jews. All these had their thinking and their teaching continually shaped by the institutions and ideas of the Old Testament. From the Old Testament they drew the greater part of what they taught. To attempt, therefore, to reach the real meaning of the New Testament without recognizing, not merely that there is a connection between it and the Old Testament, but as well that Old Testament ideas are the very centre and soul of it, is to ignore all the facts relating both to the historical development of Christianity itself, and to the gradual reception of the New Testament as authoritative and divine.

In support of the view which has been taken in regard to the necessity of the knowledge of the real meaning of the Old Testament for the right understanding of the New, and for the confirmation of the statements on this head, which have been somewhat dogmatically made, the following considerations are presented :

(1) The early church, in the days of the apostles and their immediate successors, saw in Christianity, if we may not say merely the religion of the Old Testament, then certainly a religion based on the Old Testament, and for whose contents the Old Testament was a sufficient and satisfactory warrant. This is shown by the fact that, while the Old Testament Scriptures were always received in the church of this period as authoritative and divine, the writings of the New Testament only gradually came to be acknowledged as a body of inspired Scripture, and as equal in value and authority to the Old Testament. In reference to this historic fact, which no student of the history of the early church can doubt, Westcott remarks (*Canon of the New Testament*, p. 1):

"It seems no less important.....to trace the gradual recognition of a written Apostolic rule as authoritative and divine, to observe the gradual equalization of 'the Gospel and Epistles' with the 'Law and the Prophets.'"

The same writer also says, in his article in Smith's Bible Dictionary (Article *Canon*):

"The sense of the infinite depth and paramount authority of the Old Testament was too powerful even among Gentile converts to require or to admit of the immediate addition of supplementary books. But the sense of the peculiar position which the Apostles occupied, as the original and inspired teachers of the

Christian church, was already making itself felt in the sub-apostolic age; and, by a remarkable agreement, Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius, and Barnabas draw a clear line between themselves and their predecessors, from whom they were not separated by any lengthened intervals of time."

It is clear, then, that neither Christ nor the apostles intended it to be understood that the religion and the doctrines which they preached and taught were, in any way, to abrogate, supersede, or even stand over against the Old Testament. On the contrary, they must have found in the Old Testament itself the essential elements of what they taught, and must have based all their teachings on its contents; so that their doctrines and the religion based upon these, were such as could only be completely and accurately understood in the light of the Old Testament teaching. Else the apostolic, and the sub-apostolic church, would not have accepted, with such unanimity, the Old Testament Scriptures as an authority for the contents of the Christian faith, and only gradually have given to the gospels and the epistles a rank and an authority equal to those of the law and the prophets.

(2) The apostles themselves speak of the teachings of the Old Testament in such a way as to show that they considered them to be, at least in essentials, the teachings of Christianity, and a complete guide and authority for beginning and perfecting the Christian life. Paul, for example, in 2 Tim. III., 14, 15, declares that, in the Old Testament is made known, with all needed clearness, (a) the Christian way of salvation, (b) the nature and true object of Christian faith, (c) the manner and means of true reformation of life, and (d) the way to attain perfection of Christian character. But this is only to say that the Old Testament is, "for substance of doctrine," the creed of Christendom, at least so far as concerns the great outlines of the Christian faith. Christianity, therefore, was not intended to supersede the Old Testament, still less to stand in any attitude of hostility to it. Christian doctrine is its complement, making clear its true meaning, and, in turn, made to be thoroughly understood only by its aid.

(3) Christ himself, as we are told in Matt. v., 17, declared that his teaching was not, in any sense, an abrogation of the Old Testament, but was only the outgrowth and complement of the teaching to be found in it. This will appear if we consider what must be the meaning of the word *Pleroo*, as used in this passage. The etymology of this word, the evident opposition in which it stands, in this passage, to *Kataluo*, and the clear intent of the speaker, as determined by the context, all unite in showing that it can here have no other meaning than that of *fill out*, or *complete*. What Christ meant to say, then, surely was, that this teaching was only the complement of the teach-

ing of the Old Testament, founded upon it, and, in essentials, identical with it. This teaching of his, and the religion to which it gave birth, are, then, only to be correctly understood as they are studied in the light of the Old Testament teaching.

All these considerations surely establish the truth of what was claimed at the beginning, that the doctrines and facts of the New Testament are only to be apprehended as they are approached along the way of the Old Testament teaching. Any attempt to know the truth that lies in the New Testament, if it ignores this one true way of finding it, can only end in more or less of mistake and error. The preacher, who neglects the study of the Old Testament, must either preach only some part of the glorious gospel of the Christ who interpreted in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself, or some perversion of that gospel, some "other" gospel. To do either of these things, is to fail to be the true pastor, duly feeding the flock of God.

---

## EGYPT BEFORE B. C. 2000.

BY PROFESSOR HOWARD OSGOOD, D. D.,  
Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.

### I.

It is common now for writers on the history of the east to speak of times three, four and five thousand years before Christ. They speak with so much assurance, that one might suppose there was no rational doubt of these dates. While there is much to be said in favor of these extreme dates, it is well for us to be assured that they lack for their proof indubitable contemporary monuments which have come down to our days. The tradition of a people, or rational inference from later monuments, is very uncertain ground for the firm tread of history. We may have good reason to believe that the tradition represents facts, and that our inferences are correct, but, if we possess no monumental proof, tradition and inferences should be painted as nebulae and nothing more.

I shall not deal with nebulae, but with simple, hard facts, that have been verified and reverified by numerous proofs, now extant, in sculptured stone, paintings, architecture, articles of dress, of domestic and agricultural use, and of all the employments of life. These proofs do not rest on any single monument, but are checked and stamped by many monuments and by their undesigned, yet undeniable, coincidences, the strongest of proofs.